

## **SB 35 Determination Methodology**

### **SB 35 Reporting Period**

SB 35 defines the Reporting Period as the first half of the regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) cycle or the second half of the RHNA cycle. For jurisdictions that have not completed the first half of the current (fifth) RHNA cycle, a proration will apply until the jurisdiction completes the first-half point of the cycle.

Prorated targets will be updated after Annual Progress Reports (APRs) are due each year.

APRs are on calendar years, while RHNA planning periods<sup>1</sup> may begin and end at various times throughout the year. When a planning period begins after July, the APR for that year is attributed to the prior RHNA cycle. When the planning period ends before July 1, the APR for that year will be attributed to the following RHNA cycle.

More detail is shown below by regional government or county and applies to all jurisdictions within the regional government or county.

### **Credit for Permitting during Projection Period**

Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period<sup>2</sup> before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period.

### **Annual Progress Report (APRs) Due Dates**

APRs are due each April and report on the prior calendar year's activities. As of January 2018, 2016 APRs and prior APRs were due; as of April 2018, 2017 APRs and prior APRs will have been due.

---

<sup>1</sup> **Planning Period:** The time-period between the due date for one housing element and the due date for the next housing element. This time-period can be either 8 or 5 years, depending on the jurisdiction.

<sup>2</sup> **Projection Period:** The time-period for which the regional housing need assessment (RHNA) is calculated.

**Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) and San Benito County Council of Governments (San Benito COG) – includes Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito Counties; and all cities within each county**

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Planning Period: 12/15/2015<sup>8</sup> – 12/15/2023

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 12/31/2023

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2016 2017 2018 2019
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2020 2021 2022 2023

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For these jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2014 and 2015. For assistance in counting these units contact [APR@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:APR@hcd.ca.gov).

**SB 35 Eligibility Methodology**

By January 2018:	Less than <b>1/8ths (12.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than <b>2/8ths (25%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than <b>3/8ths (37.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2019 APRs are due:	Less than <b>4/8ths (50%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2023 APRs are due	Less than <b>8/8ths (100%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

<sup>8</sup> When the planning period begins after July, the APR for that year is attributed to the prior cycle.

**Fresno Council of Governments (FCOG) and Kern Council of Governments (KCOG) – includes Fresno and Kern Counties; and all cities within each county**

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Planning Period: 12/31/2015<sup>9</sup> – 12/31/2023

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2013 – 12/31/2023

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2016 2017 2018 2019
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2020 2021 2022 2023

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For these jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2013, 2014, and 2015. For assistance in counting these units contact [APR@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:APR@hcd.ca.gov).

**SB 35 Eligibility Methodology**

By January 2018:	Less than <b>1/8ths (12.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than <b>2/8ths (25%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than <b>3/8ths (37.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2019 APRs are due:	Less than <b>4/8ths (50%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2023 APRs are due	Less than <b>8/8ths (100%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

<sup>9</sup> When the planning period begins after July, the APR for that year is attributed to the prior cycle.

**Stanislaus County Council of Governments (Stan COG) and Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) – includes Stanislaus and Tulare Counties; and all cities within each county**

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Planning Period: 12/31/2015<sup>10</sup> – 12/31/2023

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 09/30/2023

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2016 2017 2018 2019
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2020 2021 2022 2023

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For these jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2014 and 2015. For assistance in counting these units contact [APR@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:APR@hcd.ca.gov).

**SB 35 Eligibility Methodology**

By January 2018:	Less than <b>1/8ths (12.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than <b>2/8ths (25%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than <b>3/8ths (37.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2019 APRs are due:	Less than <b>4/8ths (50%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2023 APRs are due	Less than <b>8/8ths (100%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

<sup>10</sup> When the planning period begins after July, the APR for that year is attributed to the prior cycle.

**San Joaquin County Council of Governments (SJCOG) – includes San Joaquin County and all cities within the County**

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Planning Period: 12/31/2015<sup>11</sup> – 12/31/2023

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 12/31/2023

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2016 2017 2018 2019
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2020 2021 2022 2023

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For these jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2014 and 2015. For assistance in counting these units contact [APR@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:APR@hcd.ca.gov).

**SB 35 Eligibility Methodology**

By January 2018:	Less than <b>1/8ths (12.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than <b>2/8ths (25%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than <b>3/8ths (37.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2019 APRs are due:	Less than <b>4/8ths (50%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2023 APRs are due	Less than <b>8/8ths (100%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

<sup>11</sup> When the planning period begins after July, the APR for that year is attributed to the prior cycle.

**Kings County Association of Governments (KCAG) and Madera County Transportation Commission (MCTC) – includes Kings and Madera Counties; and all cities within each county**

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Planning Period: 01/31/2016 – 01/31/2024

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 12/31/2023

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2016 2017 2018 2019
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2020 2021 2022 2023

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For these jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2014 and 2015. For assistance in counting these units contact [APR@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:APR@hcd.ca.gov).

**SB 35 Eligibility Methodology**

By January 2018:	Less than <b>1/8ths (12.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than <b>2/8ths (25%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than <b>3/8ths (37.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2019 APRs are due:	Less than <b>4/8ths (50%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2023 APRs are due	Less than <b>8/8ths (100%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

**Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG) – includes Merced County and all cities within the County**

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Planning Period: 03/31/2016 – 03/31/2024

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 12/31/2023

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2016 2017 2018 2019
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2020 2021 2022 2023

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For these jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2014 and 2015. For assistance in counting these units contact [APR@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:APR@hcd.ca.gov).

**SB 35 Eligibility Methodology**

By January 2018:	Less than <b>1/8ths (12.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than <b>2/8ths (25%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than <b>3/8ths (37.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2019 APRs are due:	Less than <b>4/8ths (50%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2023 APRs are due	Less than <b>8/8ths (100%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

## SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, Monterey, San Benito, San Joaquin, Santa Cruz, Stanislaus, Tulare; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 1 year (2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 12.5% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.**

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
KERN	ARVIN	0.0%	20.9%	48.6%	0.0%
SANTA CRUZ	CAPITOLA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%
STANISLAUS	CERES	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FRESNO	COALINGA	24.0%	27.8%	19.5%	7.5%
KERN	DELANO	0.0%	0.0%	18.9%	0.2%
TULARE	DINUBA	0.0%	39.3%	41.3%	0.0%
FRESNO	FRESNO	0.3%	0.2%	9.6%	8.5%
FRESNO	FRESNO COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	31.9%	24.8%
SAN BENITO	HOLLISTER	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%
STANISLAUS	HUGHSON	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%
FRESNO	HURON	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
KERN	KERN COUNTY	2.1%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%
SAN JOAQUIN	LATHROP	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%
TULARE	LINDSAY	8.8%	53.8%	4.9%	0.0%
MERCED	LIVINGSTON	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.8%
MERCED	LOS BANOS	6.8%	4.9%	2.3%	0.0%
MADERA	MADERA	1.3%	24.0%	8.5%	0.2%
MADERA	MADERA COUNTY	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	*
KERN	MCFARLAND	3.2%	3.8%	5.0%	0.0%
MERCED	MERCED COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%	7.3%
STANISLAUS	MODESTO	0.0%	2.8%	2.6%	4.4%
MONTEREY	MONTEREY COUNTY	9.9%	2.5%	0.0%	58.8%
STANISLAUS	OAKDALE	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	32.1%
FRESNO	PARLIER	99.1%	7.3%	3.9%	*
TULARE	PORTERVILLE	0.0%	0.6%	14.0%	0.4%
FRESNO	REEDLEY	14.0%	0.0%	7.5%	0.9%
STANISLAUS	RIVERBANK	10.3%	18.4%	0.0%	9.7%
MONTEREY	SALINAS	4.6%	4.8%	0.2%	12.4%
SAN BENITO	SAN BENITO COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	100.0%
FRESNO	SANGER	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SANTA CRUZ	SANTA CRUZ	3.3%	18.6%	100.0%	44.1%
SANTA CRUZ	SANTA CRUZ COUNTY	13.2%	11.1%	20.9%	11.1%
STANISLAUS	STANISLAUS COUNTY	0.0%	2.9%	8.4%	20.4%
KERN	TAFT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.7%

## SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, Monterey, San Benito, San Joaquin, Santa Cruz, Stanislaus, Tulare; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 1 year (2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 12.5% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.**

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
TULARE	TULARE COUNTY	8.3%	8.5%	7.0%	2.4%
STANISLAUS	TURLOCK	0.2%	21.9%	93.8%	1.8%
TULARE	VISALIA	3.3%	11.6%	22.8%	16.7%
KERN	WASCO	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.6%
Merced County	ATWATER	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Kings County	AVENAL	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Kern County	BAKERSFIELD	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Kern County	CALIFORNIA CITY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Monterey County	CARMEL	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Madera County	CHOWCHILLA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	CLOVIS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Kings County	CORCORAN	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Monterey County	DEL REY OAKS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Tulare County	DINUBA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Merced County	DOS PALOS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Joaquin County	ESCALON	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Tulare County	EXETER	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Tulare County	FARMERSVILLE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	FIREBAUGH	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	FOWLER	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Monterey County	GONZALES	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Monterey County	GREENFIELD	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Merced County	GUSTINE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Kings County	HANFORD	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Benito County	HOLLISTER	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Stanislaus County	HUGHSON	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	HURON	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	KERMAN	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Monterey County	KING CITY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Kings County	KINGS COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	KINGSBURG	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Kings County	LEMOORE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Joaquin County	LODI	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Joaquin County	MANTECA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			

## SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, Monterey, San Benito, San Joaquin, Santa Cruz, Stanislaus, Tulare; and all cities within each county

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 1 year (2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 12.5% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
Kern County	MARICOPA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Monterey County	MARINA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	MENDOTA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Merced County	MERCED	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Monterey County	MONTEREY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Stanislaus County	NEWMAN	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	ORANGE COVE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Monterey County	PACIFIC GROVE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Stanislaus County	PATTERSON	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Kern County	RIDGECREST	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Joaquin County	RIPON	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Benito County	SAN BENITO COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	SAN JOAQUIN	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Joaquin County	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Benito County	SAN JUAN BAUTISTA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Monterey County	SAND CITY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Santa Cruz County	SCOTTS VALLEY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Monterey County	SEASIDE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	SELMA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Kern County	SHAFTER	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Monterey County	SOLEDAD	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Joaquin County	STOCKTON	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Kern County	TEHACHAPI	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Joaquin County	TRACY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Tulare County	TULARE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Stanislaus County	WATERFORD	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Santa Cruz County	WATSONVILLE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Tulare County	WOODLAKE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			

**Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Now Bay Area Metro – includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma Counties; and all cities within each county**

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Planning Period: 01/31/2015 – 01/31/2023

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 10/31/2022

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2015 2016 2017 2018
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2019 2020 2021 2022

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For Bay Area Metro jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2014. For assistance in counting these units contact [APR@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:APR@hcd.ca.gov).

**SB 35 Eligibility Methodology**

By January 2018:	Less than <b>2/8ths (25%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than <b>3/8ths (37.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than <b>4/8ths (50%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2022 APRs are due:	Less than <b>8/8ths (100%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

**Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) – includes Santa Barbara County and all cities within the County**

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Planning Period: 02/15/2015 – 02/15/2023

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 09/30/2022

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2015 2016 2017 2018
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2019 2020 2021 2022

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For these jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2014. For assistance in counting these units contact [APR@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:APR@hcd.ca.gov).

**SB 35 Eligibility Methodology**

By January 2018:	Less than <b>2/8ths (25%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than <b>3/8ths (37.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than <b>4/8ths (50%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2022 APRs are due:	Less than <b>8/8ths (100%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

## SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma; and all cities within each county

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 2 years (2015-2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 25% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
ALAMEDA	ALAMEDA	7.4%	11.7%	6.7%	25.7%
ALAMEDA	ALAMEDA COUNTY	28.4%	36.1%	12.2%	4.7%
ALAMEDA	ALBANY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
ALAMEDA	EMERYVILLE	1.8%	0.0%	2.7%	23.8%
NAPA	AMERICAN CANYON	0.0%	16.7%	100.0%	90.2%
ALAMEDA	HAYWARD	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	23.9%
CONTRA COSTA	ANTIOCH	24.4%	0.0%	36.0%	38.7%
ALAMEDA	NEWARK	0.0%	0.0%	22.8%	12.8%
SAN MATEO	ATHERTON	48.6%	11.5%	6.9%	100.0%
ALAMEDA	BERKELEY	16.9%	3.8%	23.5%	56.8%
CONTRA COSTA	BRENTWOOD	4.7%	41.1%	0.8%	100.0%
ALAMEDA	SAN LEANDRO	16.3%	11.5%	0.0%	0.7%
ALAMEDA	UNION CITY	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	11.5%
SAN MATEO	BRISBANE	0.0%	0.0%	6.1%	100.0%
SANTA BARBARA	BUELLTON	7.6%	9.1%	100.0%	41.1%
CONTRA COSTA	MORAGA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.7%
SAN MATEO	BURLINGAME	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	89.0%
CONTRA COSTA	CLAYTON	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%
CONTRA COSTA	CONCORD	2.4%	0.7%	0.7%	6.1%
NAPA	CALISTOGA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	53.3%
SANTA CLARA	CAMPBELL	3.6%	0.7%	1.3%	54.0%
SANTA BARBARA	CARPINTERIA	84.6%	34.6%	0.0%	79.7%
CONTRA COSTA	MARTINEZ	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	20.5%
CONTRA COSTA	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY	0.0%	3.7%	38.3%	89.7%
MARIN	FAIRFAX	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.7%
MARIN	CORTE MADERA	31.8%	100.0%	23.1%	100.0%
CONTRA COSTA	PINOLE	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	1.6%
SANTA CLARA	CUPERTINO	0.0%	0.0%	11.7%	63.7%
CONTRA COSTA	PLEASANT HILL	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	9.0%
SAN MATEO	DALY CITY	9.5%	11.7%	18.6%	44.2%
SAN MATEO	BELMONT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.4%
CONTRA COSTA	DANVILLE	0.0%	2.7%	13.7%	100.0%

## SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma; and all cities within each county

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 2 years (2015-2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 25% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
ALAMEDA	DUBLIN	3.3%	8.7%	0.9%	100.0%
CONTRA COSTA	EL CERRITO	56.0%	9.5%	37.7%	100.0%
SOLANO	FAIRFIELD	0.0%	0.5%	80.0%	50.0%
MARIN	BELVEDERE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SAN MATEO	FOSTER CITY	56.1%	56.3%	18.4%	100.0%
SAN MATEO	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO	0.0%	1.4%	8.0%	17.0%
ALAMEDA	FREMONT	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	52.9%
SANTA CLARA	GILROY	22.0%	100.0%	6.5%	100.0%
SAN MATEO	SAN MATEO COUNTY	0.0%	3.9%	12.7%	21.4%
SANTA BARBARA	GOLETA	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	100.0%
SONOMA	HEALDSBURG	0.0%	4.2%	50.0%	100.0%
SANTA BARBARA	SANTA BARBARA	6.3%	5.1%	0.0%	21.0%
CONTRA COSTA	HERCULES	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	90.2%
SAN MATEO	HILLSBOROUGH	62.5%	58.8%	57.1%	33.3%
MARIN	TIBURON	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.5%
CONTRA COSTA	LAFAYETTE	1.4%	2.6%	40.0%	100.0%
MARIN	LARKSPUR	7.5%	45.0%	42.9%	100.0%
ALAMEDA	LIVERMORE	0.0%	2.9%	62.1%	50.8%
SANTA CLARA	LOS ALTOS	1.2%	18.2%	0.9%	100.0%
SANTA CLARA	LOS GATOS	0.0%	1.8%	3.8%	34.5%
MARIN	MARIN COUNTY	18.2%	43.8%	40.5%	100.0%
SANTA CLARA	MILPITAS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
SANTA CLARA	MONTE SERENO	39.1%	8.3%	7.7%	100.0%
SANTA CLARA	MORGAN HILL	6.2%	27.3%	12.4%	100.0%
SANTA CLARA	MOUNTAIN VIEW	5.3%	27.8%	8.9%	100.0%
SAN MATEO	COLMA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
NAPA	NAPA	16.8%	14.2%	2.8%	43.4%
SAN MATEO	EAST PALO ALTO	0.0%	14.8%	39.8%	0.0%
SONOMA	SEBASTOPOL	0.0%	3.6%	37.9%	13.8%
SONOMA	SONOMA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.0%
SAN MATEO	PACIFICA	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	12.3%
ALAMEDA	OAKLAND	6.0%	2.1%	0.0%	34.9%

## SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma; and all cities within each county

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 2 years (2015-2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 25% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
SAN MATEO	SAN BRUNO	0.0%	2.5%	20.5%	12.1%
CONTRA COSTA	OAKLEY	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	83.4%
CONTRA COSTA	RICHMOND	0.0%	25.9%	0.0%	13.1%
CONTRA COSTA	ORINDA	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	73.3%
SANTA CLARA	PALO ALTO	6.2%	13.4%	5.0%	32.2%
SONOMA	PETALUMA	0.0%	0.0%	12.4%	100.0%
SAN MATEO	MILLBRAE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ALAMEDA	PIEDMONT	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
CONTRA COSTA	PITTSBURG	5.9%	83.1%	100.0%	38.0%
ALAMEDA	PLEASANTON	30.7%	9.5%	2.2%	100.0%
SAN MATEO	PORTOLA VALLEY	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	100.0%
SAN MATEO	REDWOOD CITY	1.0%	4.2%	0.0%	100.0%
SANTA CLARA	SARATOGA	0.0%	18.9%	1.9%	12.9%
SANTA BARBARA	LOMPOC	0.0%	0.0%	46.3%	0.0%
MARIN	ROSS	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%
NAPA	SAINT HELENA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
MARIN	SAN ANSELMO	39.4%	94.1%	5.3%	32.4%
SONOMA	SANTA ROSA	5.2%	20.1%	4.5%	20.3%
SONOMA	COTATI	2.9%	16.7%	0.0%	24.2%
SAN MATEO	SAN CARLOS	1.0%	11.2%	7.2%	100.0%
SAN FRANCISCO	SAN FRANCISCO	9.1%	20.0%	6.0%	54.5%
SANTA CLARA	SAN JOSE	7.1%	4.3%	0.0%	53.9%
SAN MATEO	SAN MATEO	1.4%	5.5%	30.2%	62.1%
CONTRA COSTA	SAN PABLO	0.0%	2.0%	6.0%	29.0%
MARIN	SAN RAFAEL	1.3%	13.5%	5.5%	29.9%
CONTRA COSTA	SAN RAMON	3.9%	29.4%	59.9%	100.0%
SAN MATEO	HALF MOON BAY	100.0%	9.7%	16.7%	19.0%
SAN MATEO	MENLO PARK	45.1%	4.7%	0.0%	17.3%
SANTA BARBARA	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY	30.8%	45.3%	100.0%	72.2%
SANTA CLARA	SANTA CLARA	0.2%	0.2%	5.0%	80.9%
SANTA CLARA	SANTA CLARA COUNTY	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
SANTA BARBARA	SANTA MARIA	2.7%	9.0%	80.0%	28.4%

## SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma; and all cities within each county

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 2 years (2015-2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 25% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
SOLANO	BENICIA	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	5.7%
SOLANO	DIXON	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
MARIN	MILL VALLEY	19.5%	37.5%	30.8%	21.1%
MARIN	NOVATO	16.2%	18.5%	2.8%	23.4%
SOLANO	SOLANO COUNTY	11.5%	53.3%	26.3%	37.2%
MARIN	SAUSALITO	34.6%	100.0%	18.8%	17.4%
SOLANO	VALLEJO	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.8%
SONOMA	CLOVERDALE	64.1%	24.1%	0.0%	0.0%
SONOMA	SONOMA COUNTY	46.8%	55.9%	81.9%	66.2%
SOLANO	SUISUN CITY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.2%
SONOMA	ROHNERT PARK	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
SANTA CLARA	SUNNYVALE	2.6%	0.1%	4.6%	51.5%
SOLANO	VACAVILLE	7.0%	34.3%	100.0%	74.9%
CONTRA COSTA	WALNUT CREEK	7.0%	4.5%	3.1%	43.8%
SONOMA	WINDSOR	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	35.6%
SAN MATEO	WOODSIDE	13.0%	15.4%	0.0%	54.5%
NAPA	YOUNTVILLE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Solano County	DIXON	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Santa Barbara County	GUADALUPE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Santa Barbara County	LOMPOC	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Santa Clara County	LOS ALTOS HILLS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Napa County	NAPA COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Solano County	RIO VISTA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Santa Barbara County	SOLVANG	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			

**Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) – includes Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura Counties, and all cities within each county**

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Planning Period: 10/15/2013<sup>4</sup> – 10/15/2021

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 10/31/2021

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2014 2015 2016 2017
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2018 2019 2020 2021

Note: Due to an anomaly in setting the SCAG planning and projection period for the 5<sup>th</sup> housing element cycle, the SCAG projection period begins after the planning period. To account for this, SCAG jurisdictions can count permits from the last two months of 2013 on their 2014 APRs. For assistance in counting these units contact [APR@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:APR@hcd.ca.gov).

**SB 35 Eligibility Methodology**

By January 2018:	Less than <b>3/8ths (37.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than <b>4/8ths (50%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2021 APRs are due:	Less than <b>8/8ths (100%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

---

<sup>4</sup> When the planning period begins after July, the APR for that year is attributed to the prior cycle.

**Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) – includes El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties, and all cities within each county**

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Planning Period: 10/31/2013<sup>3</sup> – 10/31/2021

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2013 – 10/31/2021

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2014 2015 2016 2017
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2018 2019 2020 2021

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period. For SACOG jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2013. For assistance in counting these units contact [APR@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:APR@hcd.ca.gov).

**SB 35 Eligibility Methodology**

By January 2018:	Less than <b>3/8ths (37.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than <b>4/8ths (50%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2021 APRs are due:	Less than <b>8/8ths (100%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

---

<sup>3</sup> When the planning period begins after July, the APR for that year is attributed to the prior cycle.

## Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) – includes the City of South Lake Tahoe

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Planning Period: 06/15/2014 – 06/15/2022<sup>5</sup>

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2013 – 10/31/2021

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2014 2015 2016 2017
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2018 2019 2020 2021

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For TRPA jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2013. For assistance in counting these units contact [APR@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:APR@hcd.ca.gov).

### SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

By January 2018:	Less than <b>3/8ths (37.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than <b>4/8ths (50%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2021 APRs are due:	Less than <b>8/8ths (100%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

<sup>5</sup> When the planning period ends before July 1, the APR for that year will be attributed to the following cycle.

**Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) – includes Butte County and all cities within the County**

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Planning Period: 06/15/2014 – 06/15/2022<sup>6</sup>

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 06/15/2022

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2014 2015 2016 2017
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2018 2019 2020 2021

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For BCAG jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2014, which will already be included on their 2014 APR.

**SB 35 Eligibility Methodology**

By January 2018:	Less than <b>3/8ths (37.5%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than <b>4/8ths (50%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2021 APRs are due:	Less than <b>8/8ths (100%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

<sup>6</sup> When the planning period ends before July 1, the APR for that year will be attributed to the following cycle.

## SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yola, and Yuba; and all cities within each county

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 37.5% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
LOS ANGELES	AGOURA HILLS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	75.6%
LOS ANGELES	ALHAMBRA	0.0%	3.6%	1.6%	37.5%
ORANGE	ALISO VIEJO	39.5%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%
ORANGE	ANAHEIM	5.5%	2.4%	4.2%	100.0%
SAN BERNARDINO	APPLE VALLEY	0.1%	1.3%	1.8%	8.0%
PLACER	AUBURN	0.0%	0.0%	19.3%	36.8%
LOS ANGELES	BALDWIN PARK	33.1%	20.5%	0.0%	29.3%
RIVERSIDE	BANNING	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SAN BERNARDINO	BARSTOW	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%
LOS ANGELES	BELL	0.0%	0.0%	37.5%	47.6%
LOS ANGELES	BELLFLOWER	0.4%	9.8%	3.4%	50.0%
LOS ANGELES	BEVERLY HILLS	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	*
BUTTE	BIGGS	54.2%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
IMPERIAL	BRAWLEY	4.4%	7.6%	10.9%	0.5%
ORANGE	BREA	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	19.9%
ORANGE	BUENA PARK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.2%
LOS ANGELES	BURBANK	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	27.2%
LOS ANGELES	CALABASAS	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	28.2%
VENTURA	CAMARILLO	12.4%	18.6%	92.7%	23.1%
LOS ANGELES	CARSON	0.0%	0.0%	16.4%	11.7%
RIVERSIDE	CATHEDRAL	0.0%	0.0%	48.2%	1.2%
BUTTE	CHICO	1.4%	0.6%	0.1%	62.3%
SAN BERNARDINO	CHINO	36.3%	0.0%	0.9%	100.0%
SAN BERNARDINO	CHINO HILLS	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	67.9%
SACRAMENTO	CITRUS HEIGHTS	0.0%	3.9%	18.5%	15.4%
RIVERSIDE	COACHELLA	6.8%	5.7%	0.0%	*
PLACER	COLFAX	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SAN BERNARDINO	COLTON	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	2.3%
RIVERSIDE	CORONA	27.6%	14.1%	43.7%	100.0%
ORANGE	COSTA MESA	0.0%	0.0%	*	*
LOS ANGELES	CUDAHY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

## SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yola, and Yuba; and all cities within each county

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 37.5% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
ORANGE	DANA POINT	0.0%	0.0%	14.8%	59.9%
YOLO	DAVIS	16.9%	23.0%	18.7%	72.0%
LOS ANGELES	DOWNEY	0.0%	4.9%	51.9%	19.9%
LOS ANGELES	DUARTE	48.3%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%
IMPERIAL	EL CENTRO	0.0%	4.7%	28.3%	6.9%
EL DORADO	EL DORADO COUNTY	4.0%	25.5%	3.9%	100.0%
LOS ANGELES	EL MONTE	28.5%	13.3%	2.3%	7.2%
SACRAMENTO	ELK GROVE	2.4%	1.0%	19.7%	69.1%
SACRAMENTO	FOLSOM	0.0%	0.0%	26.0%	46.3%
SAN BERNARDINO	FONTANA	4.4%	15.1%	0.0%	43.3%
ORANGE	FOUNTAIN VALLEY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%
ORANGE	FULLERTON	42.8%	28.4%	2.7%	54.5%
SACRAMENTO	GALT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	78.9%
ORANGE	GARDEN GROVE	0.0%	11.7%	51.1%	39.9%
LOS ANGELES	GARDENA	0.0%	0.0%	30.3%	36.4%
LOS ANGELES	GLENDALE	16.3%	19.4%	0.3%	100.0%
LOS ANGELES	GLENDORA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
SAN BERNARDINO	GRAND TERRACE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
LOS ANGELES	HAWTHORNE	0.0%	100.0%	30.4%	100.0%
RIVERSIDE	HEMET	0.0%	43.8%	100.0%	45.0%
SAN BERNARDINO	HESPERIA	0.0%	7.3%	50.0%	37.0%
SAN BERNARDINO	HIGHLAND	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%
IMPERIAL	IMPERIAL COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%
RIVERSIDE	INDIAN WELLS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
RIVERSIDE	INDIO	11.8%	0.0%	0.2%	71.9%
LOS ANGELES	INGLEWOOD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%
ORANGE	IRVINE	31.3%	0.1%	100.0%	100.0%
LOS ANGELES	LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.4%
ORANGE	LA HABRA	0.0%	3.9%	100.0%	100.0%
ORANGE	LA PALMA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ORANGE	LAGUNA BEACH	0.0%	0.0%	*	*

## SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yola, and Yuba; and all cities within each county

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 37.5% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
ORANGE	LAGUNA HILLS	0.0%	0.0%	*	*
RIVERSIDE	LAKE ELSINORE	0.0%	0.0%	65.6%	19.7%
ORANGE	LAKE FOREST	3.1%	37.1%	44.5%	100.0%
LOS ANGELES	LAKEWOOD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	43.4%
PLACER	LINCOLN	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.8%
SUTTER	LIVE OAK	88.5%	51.4%	3.6%	2.1%
LOS ANGELES	LOMITA	0.0%	28.6%	100.0%	0.0%
LOS ANGELES	LONG BEACH	7.7%	2.1%	0.0%	31.8%
LOS ANGELES	LOS ANGELES	13.1%	20.9%	2.0%	100.0%
LOS ANGELES	LOS ANGELES COUNTY	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	23.3%
LOS ANGELES	MALIBU	0.0%	0.0%	*	*
RIVERSIDE	MENIFEE	0.5%	0.3%	46.9%	28.5%
ORANGE	MISSION VIEJO	31.0%	96.6%	48.5%	100.0%
LOS ANGELES	MONROVIA	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	100.0%
VENTURA	MOORPARK	1.7%	9.1%	8.3%	100.0%
RIVERSIDE	MORENO VALLEY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%
RIVERSIDE	MURRIETA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%
ORANGE	NEWPORT BEACH	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS ANGELES	NORWALK	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	8.7%
VENTURA	OJAI	0.0%	0.0%	27.1%	3.9%
SAN BERNARDINO	ONTARIO	0.0%	0.0%	42.6%	19.1%
ORANGE	ORANGE	0.0%	1.7%	12.1%	4.5%
ORANGE	ORANGE COUNTY	24.8%	26.5%	18.4%	100.0%
BUTTE	OROVILLE	0.0%	17.6%	0.0%	3.1%
VENTURA	OXNARD	11.6%	23.6%	0.3%	4.0%
RIVERSIDE	PALM DESERT	3.4%	4.7%	0.0%	11.7%
RIVERSIDE	PALM SPRINGS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.8%
LOS ANGELES	PALMDALE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%
BUTTE	PARADISE	0.0%	8.0%	7.5%	8.6%
LOS ANGELES	PARAMOUNT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.7%
LOS ANGELES	PASADENA	40.9%	18.4%	20.1%	100.0%

## SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yola, and Yuba; and all cities within each county

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 37.5% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
RIVERSIDE	PERRIS	35.0%	0.0%	29.2%	38.6%
ORANGE	PLACENTIA	0.0%	0.0%	34.4%	50.2%
PLACER	PLACER COUNTY	2.6%	8.6%	1.8%	66.7%
EL DORADO	PLACERVILLE	0.0%	0.0%	47.8%	71.2%
SACRAMENTO	RANCHO CORDOVA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	29.6%
SAN BERNARDINO	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS ANGELES	RANCHO PALOS VERDES	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
ORANGE	RANCHO SANTA MARGARITA	0.0%	0.0%	*	*
SAN BERNARDINO	RIALTO	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%
RIVERSIDE	RIVERSIDE	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%
RIVERSIDE	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	1.1%	1.1%	9.5%	15.2%
PLACER	ROCKLIN	0.0%	0.0%	85.5%	76.7%
LOS ANGELES	ROSEMEAD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
PLACER	ROSEVILLE	2.2%	1.8%	74.4%	60.6%
SACRAMENTO	SACRAMENTO	6.3%	16.1%	67.1%	18.3%
SACRAMENTO	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	2.4%	5.3%	23.9%	18.5%
SAN BERNARDINO	SAN BERNARDINO	5.8%	2.6%	0.0%	0.7%
SAN BERNARDINO	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
VENTURA	SAN BUENAVENTURA	8.9%	2.0%	6.4%	24.0%
LOS ANGELES	SAN DIMAS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.5%
LOS ANGELES	SAN FERNANDO	50.9%	43.8%	0.0%	37.9%
LOS ANGELES	SAN GABRIEL	1.3%	0.0%	40.9%	26.9%
RIVERSIDE	SAN JACINTO	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	9.8%
ORANGE	SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO	0.0%	1.9%	1.7%	100.0%
LOS ANGELES	SAN MARINO	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	*
ORANGE	SANTA ANA	12.8%	26.2%	35.1%	100.0%
LOS ANGELES	SANTA FE SPRINGS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS ANGELES	SANTA MONICA	49.1%	39.2%	6.4%	93.3%
LOS ANGELES	SIGNAL HILL	100.0%	100.0%	67.9%	5.7%
VENTURA	SIMI VALLEY	0.0%	0.5%	6.6%	48.5%
ORANGE	STANTON	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	68.6%

## SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yola, and Yuba; and all cities within each county

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 37.5% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
RIVERSIDE	TEMECULA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
VENTURA	THOUSAND OAKS	20.2%	3.4%	100.0%	100.0%
ORANGE	TUSTIN	0.4%	45.1%	49.1%	100.0%
SAN BERNARDINO	UPLAND	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.1%
VENTURA	VENTURA COUNTY	7.3%	20.2%	19.0%	21.6%
LOS ANGELES	WALNUT	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	92.8%
LOS ANGELES	WEST COVINA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS ANGELES	WEST HOLLYWOOD	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
YOLO	WEST SACRAMENTO	9.7%	2.0%	54.4%	5.1%
ORANGE	WESTMINSTER	0.0%	0.0%	*	*
LOS ANGELES	WHITTIER	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	10.3%
RIVERSIDE	WILDOMAR	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	44.3%
YOLO	WINTERS	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%
YOLO	WOODLAND	11.8%	6.6%	39.3%	58.6%
YOLO	YOLO COUNTY	10.8%	2.7%	3.7%	2.6%
ORANGE	YORBA LINDA	33.8%	12.4%	0.0%	46.7%
SUTTER	YUBA CITY	0.3%	1.6%	19.5%	8.9%
YUBA	YUBA COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	4.2%
SAN BERNARDINO	YUCAIPA	5.4%	6.4%	0.0%	16.8%
SAN BERNARDINO	YUCCA VALLEY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%
San Bernardino County	ADELANTO	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	ARCADIA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	ARTESIA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	AVALON	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	AZUSA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Riverside County	BEAUMONT	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	BELL GARDENS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Bernardino County	BIG BEAR LAKE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Butte County	BIGGS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Riverside County	BLYTHE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			

## SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yola, and Yuba; and all cities within each county

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 37.5% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
Los Angeles County	BRADBURY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Orange County	BREA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Butte County	BUTTE COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Imperial County	CALEXICO	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Riverside County	CALIMESA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Imperial County	CALIPATRIA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Riverside County	CANYON LAKE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	CERRITOS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Bernardino County	CHINO	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	CLAREMONT	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Riverside County	COACHELLA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Placer County	COLFAX	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	COMMERCE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	COMPTON	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	COVINA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	CULVER CITY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Orange County	CYPRESS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Riverside County	DESERT HOT SPRINGS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	DIAMOND BAR	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	DUARTE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Riverside County	EASTVALE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	EL SEGUNDO	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Ventura County	FILLMORE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	GARDENA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Butte County	GRIDLEY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	HAWAIIAN GARDENS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	HERMOSA BEACH	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	HIDDEN HILLS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			

**SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yola, and Yuba; and all cities within each county**

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 37.5% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
San Bernardino County	HIGHLAND	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Imperial County	HOLTVILLE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Orange County	HUNTINGTON BEACH	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	HUNTINGTON PARK	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Imperial County	IMPERIAL	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	INDUSTRY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	IRWINDALE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Sacramento County	ISLETON	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Riverside County	JURUPA VALLEY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Orange County	LA HABRA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	LA HABRA HEIGHTS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	LA MIRADA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	LA PUENTE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Riverside County	LA QUINTA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	LA VERNE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Orange County	LAGUNA BEACH	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Orange County	LAGUNA NIGUEL	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Orange County	LAGUNA WOODS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	LANCASTER	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	LAWNDALE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Bernardino County	LOMA LINDA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Placer County	LOOMIS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Orange County	LOS ALAMITOS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	LYNWOOD	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	MALIBU	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	MANHATTAN BEACH	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Yuba County	MARYSVILLE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	MAYWOOD	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			

## SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yola, and Yuba; and all cities within each county

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 37.5% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
San Bernardino County	MONTCLAIR	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	MONTEBELLO	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	MONTEREY PARK	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Bernardino County	NEEDLES	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Riverside County	NORCO	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Riverside County	PALM DESERT	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	PALMDALE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	PALOS VERDES ESTATES	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	PICO RIVERA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	POMONA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Ventura County	PORT HUENEME	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Riverside County	RANCHO MIRAGE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Bernardino County	REDLANDS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	REDONDO BEACH	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Bernardino County	RIALTO	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	ROLLING HILLS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	ROLLING HILLS ESTATES	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Bernardino County	SAN BERNARDINO	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Bernardino County	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Orange County	SAN CLEMENTE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	SAN GABRIEL	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	SANTA CLARITA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Ventura County	SANTA PAULA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Orange County	SEAL BEACH	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	SIERRA MADRE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	SOUTH EL MONTE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	SOUTH GATE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
El Dorado County	SOUTH LAKE TAHOE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			

**SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yola, and Yuba; and all cities within each county**

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 37.5% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
Los Angeles County	SOUTH PASADENA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Sutter County	SUTTER COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Riverside County	TEMECULA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	TEMPLE CITY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	TORRANCE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Bernardino County	TWENTYNINE PALMS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	VERNON	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Bernardino County	VICTORVILLE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Orange County	VILLA PARK	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	WESTLAKE VILLAGE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Imperial County	WESTMORLAND	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Yuba County	WHEATLAND	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Yolo County	WINTERS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Yuba County	YUBA COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Bernardino County	YUCAIPA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			

**San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)-includes San Diego County and all cities within the County**

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Planning Period: 04/30/2013 – 04/30/2021

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2010 – 12/31/2020

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2013 2014 2015 2016
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2017 2018 2019 2020

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For SANDAG jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2010, 2011, and 2012, which can be counted on 2013 APRs. For assistance in counting these units contact [APR@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:APR@hcd.ca.gov).

**SB 35 Eligibility Methodology**

By January 2018:	Less than <b>4/8ths (50%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2020 APRs are due:	Less than <b>8/8ths (100%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

## SB 35 Determination for the Counties of San Diego; and all cities within the County

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 4 year (2013-2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 50% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.**

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
SAN DIEGO	CARLSBAD	4.6%	30.0%	19.9%	86.2%
SAN DIEGO	CHULA VISTA	1.4%	8.0%	3.8%	63.0%
SAN DIEGO	CORONADO	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
SAN DIEGO	DEL MAR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	61.8%
SAN DIEGO	EL CAJON	3.3%	0.6%	1.1%	5.7%
SAN DIEGO	ENCINITAS	4.4%	4.3%	0.2%	43.9%
SAN DIEGO	ESCONDIDO	0.7%	5.1%	0.1%	20.8%
SAN DIEGO	IMPERIAL BEACH	4.8%	54.2%	11.1%	40.8%
SAN DIEGO	LA MESA	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	25.3%
SAN DIEGO	LEMON GROVE	74.0%	96.6%	33.3%	79.8%
SAN DIEGO	NATIONAL CITY	9.7%	30.6%	14.4%	28.3%
SAN DIEGO	OCEANSIDE	5.4%	4.7%	5.8%	13.5%
SAN DIEGO	POWAY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.4%
SAN DIEGO	SAN DIEGO	5.5%	10.8%	0.0%	61.6%
SAN DIEGO	SAN DIEGO COUNTY	1.2%	13.9%	12.3%	21.7%
SAN DIEGO	SAN MARCOS	10.5%	9.7%	6.8%	99.1%
SAN DIEGO	SANTEE	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	25.7%
SAN DIEGO	SOLANA BEACH	0.0%	4.6%	0.0%	18.3%
SAN DIEGO	VISTA	27.4%	15.4%	0.4%	100.0%
SAN DIEGO	OCEANSIDE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			

**Counties of Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Mariposa, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Plumas, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity, and Tuolumne; and all cities within each county**

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Planning Period: 06/30/2014 – 06/30/2019

5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 06/30/2019<sup>7</sup>

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2014 2015 2016
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2017 2018

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For the jurisdictions noted above, this includes permits from 2014, which will already be included on their 2014 APR.

### **SB 35 Eligibility Methodology**

By January 2018:	Less than <b>3/5ths (60%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than <b>5/5ths (100%)</b> permitting progress toward 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

<sup>7</sup> When the planning period ends before July 1, the APR for that year will be attributed to the following cycle.

**SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Mariposa, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Plumas, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity, Tuolumne; and all cities within each county**

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 5-year planning period. **Less than 60% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
SHASTA	ANDERSON	0.0%	19.0%	100.0%	16.9%
HUMBOLDT	ARCATA	50.6%	8.9%	87.1%	10.0%
SAN LUIS OBISPO	ATASCADERO	49.0%	41.9%	100.0%	95.1%
INYO	BISHOP	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
COLUSA	COLUSA COUNTY	2.8%	4.4%	75.8%	19.0%
DEL NORTE	DEL NORTE COUNTY	16.7%	13.5%	36.7%	35.8%
SISKIYOU	DORRIS	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%
HUMBOLDT	EUREKA	0.0%	57.3%	7.7%	8.0%
MENDOCINO	FORT BRAGG	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	33.3%
NEVADA	GRASS VALLEY	10.7%	84.1%	1.0%	2.3%
SAN LUIS OBISPO	GROVER BEACH	0.0%	19.2%	0.0%	91.3%
HUMBOLDT	HUMBOLDT COUNTY	10.0%	12.5%	54.1%	13.7%
INYO	INYO COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.3%
AMADOR	JACKSON	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
MONO	MAMMOTH LAKES	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
MARIPOSA	MARIPOSA COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	54.4%	12.4%
MENDOCINO	MENDOCINO COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MONO	MONO COUNTY	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SISKIYOU	MOUNT SHASTA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%
NEVADA	NEVADA COUNTY	23.6%	43.7%	55.3%	63.4%
GLENN	ORLAND	0.0%	0.0%	71.4%	0.0%
SAN LUIS OBISPO	PASO ROBLES	85.4%	57.1%	52.9%	77.6%
PLUMAS	PLUMAS COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	100.0%
TEHAMA	RED BLUFF	0.0%	50.0%	3.3%	0.0%
SHASTA	REDDING	2.0%	4.0%	6.6%	13.9%
SAN LUIS OBISPO	SAN LUIS OBISPO	11.6%	22.9%	7.4%	51.3%
SAN LUIS OBISPO	SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY	6.8%	23.2%	29.5%	100.0%
SHASTA	SHASTA LAKE	28.1%	61.9%	34.8%	0.0%
TUOLUMNE	SONORA	0.0%	62.5%	31.6%	9.5%

**SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Mariposa, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Plumas, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity, Tuolumne; and all cities within each county**

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 5-year planning period. **Less than 60% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
AMADOR	SUTTER CREEK	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
TEHAMA	TEHAMA COUNTY	14.3%	39.5%	15.7%	24.9%
NEVADA	TRUCKEE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	62.6%
TUOLUMNE	TUOLUMNE COUNTY	0.0%	5.4%	0.0%	17.1%
MENDOCINO	UKIAH	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	5.0%
GLENN	WILLOWS	100.0%	18.2%	9.1%	0.0%
SISKIYOU	YREKA	0.0%	0.0%	10.5%	0.0%
Alpine County	ALPINE COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Modoc County	ALTURAS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Amador County	AMADOR	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Amador County	AMADOR COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Shasta County	ANDERSON	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Calaveras County	ANGELS CAMP	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Humboldt County	ARCATA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Luis Obispo County	ARROYO GRANDE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Luis Obispo County	ATASCADERO	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Inyo County	BISHOP	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Humboldt County	BLUE LAKE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Calaveras County	CALAVERAS COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Lake County	CLEARLAKE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Colusa County	COLUSA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Colusa County	COLUSA COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Tehama County	CORNING	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Del Norte County	CRESCENT CITY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Del Norte County	DEL NORTE COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Siskiyou County	DORRIS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Siskiyou County	DUNSMUIR	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			

**SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Mariposa, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Plumas, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity, Tuolumne; and all cities within each county**

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 5-year planning period. **Less than 60% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
Siskiyou County	ETNA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Humboldt County	EUREKA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Humboldt County	FERNDALE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Mendocino County	FORT BRAGG	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Siskiyou County	FORT JONES	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Humboldt County	FORTUNA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Glenn County	GLENN COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Nevada County	GRASS VALLEY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Luis Obispo County	GROVER BEACH	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Humboldt County	HUMBOLDT COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Inyo County	INYO COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Amador County	IONE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Amador County	JACKSON	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Lake County	LAKE COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Lake County	LAKEPORT	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Lassen County	LASSEN COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Sierra County	LOYALTON	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Mono County	MAMMOTH LAKES	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Mariposa County	MARIPOSA COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Mendocino County	MENDOCINO COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Modoc County	MODOC COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Mono County	MONO COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Siskiyou County	MONTAGUE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Luis Obispo County	MORRO BAY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Siskiyou County	MOUNT SHASTA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Nevada County	NEVADA CITY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			

**SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Mariposa, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Plumas, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity, Tuolumne; and all cities within each county**

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 5-year planning period. **Less than 60% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
Nevada County	NEVADA COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Glenn County	ORLAND	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Luis Obispo County	PASO ROBLES	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Luis Obispo County	PISMO BEACH	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Plumas County	PLUMAS COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Amador County	PLYMOUTH	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Mendocino County	POINT ARENA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Plumas County	PORTOLA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Tehama County	RED BLUFF	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Shasta County	REDDING	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Humboldt County	RIO DELL	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Luis Obispo County	SAN LUIS OBISPO	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
San Luis Obispo County	SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Shasta County	SHASTA COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Shasta County	SHASTA LAKE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Sierra County	SIERRA COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Siskiyou County	SISKIYOU COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Tuolumne County	SONORA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Lassen County	SUSANVILLE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Amador County	SUTTER CREEK	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Tehama County	TEHAMA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Tehama County	TEHAMA COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Humboldt County	TRINIDAD	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Trinity County	TRINITY COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Siskiyou County	TULELAKE	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Tuolumne County	TUOLUMNE COUNTY	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			

**SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Mariposa, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Plumas, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity, Tuolumne; and all cities within each county**

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 5-year planning period. **Less than 60% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above.*

*(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2016) Not Submitted)*

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLE TE	LI % COMPLE TE	MOD % COMPLE TE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLE TE
Mendocino County	UKIAH	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Siskiyou County	WEED	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Colusa County	WILLIAMS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Mendocino County	WILLITS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Glenn County	WILLOWS	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			
Siskiyou County	YREKA	No 2016 Annual Progress Report			